

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action dated March 29, 2005. In that Office Action, claims 1-21 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 1-19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dardinski et al. (USPN 6,754,885); and claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski as applied to claim 18, and further in view of Call (USPN 6,154,738). Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this Response, no claims have been amended; no new claims have been added; and no claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-21 remain present for examination.

Specification

The disclosure has been objected to because of informalities. These informalities have been corrected. The Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing this out.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dardinski et al. (USPN 6,754,885). In order for a reference to anticipate a claim under any subsection of 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must disclose each and every element as set forth in the claim. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As argued in the following remarks, Dardinski et al. does not disclose each and every element of claim 1 pending in the present application, and as such, Applicants respectfully contend that the instant rejections based thereon are no longer valid and should be withdrawn. Regarding claim 1, Dardinski et al. does not show the limitation of receiving a request to perform the management task in relation to the first managed object. Dardinski et al. may disclose a network administrator wanting to change passwords for a user. However, the present invention is directed to receiving a request to perform a management task. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 1 of the present disclosure is allowable over the reference cited, and respectfully requests it be allowed.

Furthermore, regarding claim 1, Dardinski et al. does not show the limitation of determining which resource to call in response to the request. Dardinski et al. may disclose a network administrator wanting to change passwords for a user. No determination of a resource is

made in response to a request is disclosed. For this additional reason Applicants submit the Dardinski et al. reference does not disclose each and every element of claim 1 of the present disclosure. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 1 of the present disclosure is allowable over the reference cited, and respectfully requests it be allowed.

Yet further, Dardinski et al. does not show the limitation of sending a task request to the determined resource to perform the management task. Again the Examiner cites a portion of the Dardinski et al. reference that deals with a network administrator changing permission for a user profile. This is very different than sending a task request to the determined resource, as included in claim 1 of the present disclosure. For all of these reasons Applicants submit claim 1 of the present disclosure is allowable over the reference cited, and respectfully requests it be allowed. Since claims 2-12 depend from allowable claim 1, Applicants submit they are also allowable, and respectfully requests claims 2-12 be allowed.

Regarding claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit the Dardinski et al. reference does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1 of the present disclosure. Specifically, Dardinski et al. does not show the limitation of receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment. Dardinski et al. may disclose a network administrator setting up a new user profile. This is not in any way receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment. Creating a user profile has nothing to do with a new resource in a network environment. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 13 of the present disclosure is allowable over the reference cited, and respectfully requests it be allowed.

Furthermore, Dardinski et al. does not show the limitation of the installation process including communication information with the new resource. Because no new resource is disclosed or suggested in the cited reference, communication information with the new resource is also not disclosed or suggested. Therefore, for all of these reasons, Applicants submit claim 13 of the present disclosure is allowable over the reference cited, and respectfully requests it be allowed. Since claims 14-21 depend from allowable claim 13, Applicants submit they are also allowable, and respectfully requests claims 2-12 be allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardinski as applied to claim 18, and further in view of Call (USPN 6,154,738). In order to establish *prima facie* obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), three basic criteria must be met, namely: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine the references or modify the reference teaching; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the reference or references when combined must teach or suggest each claim limitation (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §2142). Applicants submit that the Office Action failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and therefore the burden has not properly shifted to Applicants to present evidence of nonobviousness.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims, specifically as to claim 20, no reference has shown the limitation of receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment, or the installation process including communication information with the new resource, as required by claim 13, which claim 20 depends upon. Since the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case, Applicants submit claim 20 of the present disclosure is allowable over the references cited, and respectfully requests it be allowed.

Conclusion

Based on the above, it is believed all claims are in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request that this case be moved to allowance. Moreover, since the remarks above are believed to distinguish over the applied reference(s), Applicants specifically do not acquiesce to any other arguments not addressed herein that arguably support the claim rejections.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional

Application No. 10/014,293

issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

6/29/05

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

T. B. Scull

Timothy B. Scull, #42,137
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1648